



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,000	10/14/2003	Nick Scott Russell	IDF 2420 (4000-13300)	4770
28003	7590	09/04/2007		
SPRINT			EXAMINER	
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY			CAO, PHUONG THAO	
KSOPHT0101-Z2100				
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/685,000

Applicant(s)

RUSSELL, NICK SCOTT

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 5/21/2007 and entered with an RCE.
2. Claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 21 and 22 have been amended. Currently, claims 1-22 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/18/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Regarding Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Landfield and Couch, Examiner disagrees. Both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and a user interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success. In addition, since reading function (either destructive or non-destructive) allows access

to the message data, the administrator of the management system with reading functions would not only control the effective delivery of messages in the queue but also control the content of the messages.

5. Regarding Applicant's argument that neither Landfield nor Couch disclose one or more of the second systems are not mature enough to read the plurality of messages from the queue, Examiner disagrees. Landfield teaches in column 7, lines 3-20, a situation of a message addressed to non-existing location (e.g., application or system) wherein non-existing system is broadly interpreted as the system which is not mature to read the plurality of messages from the queues as claimed.

6. Regarding Applicant's argument that neither Landfield nor Couch disclose a first module that is not a normal receiver of the message that is selectable between non-destructively and destructively reading message from the queue, Examiner disagrees. Couch teaches in paragraphs [0030]-[0034] a messaging system which uses message queues to store messages sending from one application (first system) to another application (second system) wherein the second system is a normal receiver of the message. The table function (first module) selectable between non-destructively reading and destructively reading message from the queue (see Couch, [0048]) served as the messaging function is used to access messages from the queue and is not a normal receiver of the message.

7. Regarding other Applicant's arguments (in section IV and V of the Remarks), these arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

8. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the originally submitted drawings are informal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

Applicant is given a TWO MONTH time period to submit new drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.81. Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely submit replacement drawing sheets will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Art Unit: 2164

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the language "not...enough" (line 6) is indefinite since it raises question as to whether a system is considered as "enough" or "not... enough".

Claims 2-12 are rejected as incorporating the deficiencies of claim 1 upon which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2164

12. Claims 1 and 4-12 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333, issued on 7/27/1999) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109, effective filing date 1/2/2002).

As to claim 1, Landfield et al. teaches:

“A system for managing messages on a queue” (see Landfield et al., Abstract, [column 2, lines 20-32] and [column 5, lines 35-45]), comprising:

“one or more first test systems that send a plurality of messages directed to one or more second systems” (see Landfield et al., [column 1, lines 20-30], [column 2, lines 50-60] and [column 3, lines 1-3] wherein electronic mail message is sent from one computer (i.e., mail application program) to another wherein any computer or program can be interpreted as a test system);

“a messaging service system for directing the plurality of messages to the second systems through the queue, wherein one or more of the second systems are not mature enough to read the plurality of messages from the queue” (see Landfield et al., [column 3, lines 35-40] and [column 5, lines 20-33] wherein send mail process associated with message queues on each firewall host system as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “messaging service system”; see [column 7, lines 3-20] for a situation of a message addressed to non-existing location (e.g., application or system) wherein non-existing system is broadly interpreted as the system which is not mature to read the plurality of messages from the queues as claimed); and

“a computer system for managing messages on the queue by executing a first module and a second module” (see Landfield et al., [column 2, lines 10-30] and [column 5, lines 35-50])

Art Unit: 2164

wherein the computer implementing the electronic mail management system is equivalent to Applicant's "computer system"):

"wherein the first module reads the plurality of messages from the queue wherein the plurality of messages not directed to the first module and the first module is not a normal receiver of the plurality of messages" (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 40-50] and [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein the disclosure of displaying information about each message indicates that message must be read before its information is displayed; also see [column 5, lines 65-67] wherein to save messages must include to read messages wherein the module performing reading messages from the queue and a component of electronic mail management system which is not a normal receiver of the plurality of messages is interpreted as first module); and

"wherein a second module displays the plurality of messages read from the queue" (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 40-55] and Fig. 3A).

However, Landfield et al. does not teach:

"wherein the first module is selectable in a mutually exclusive manner between destructively reading the messages from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue".

On the other hand, Couch et al. teaches:

"wherein the first module is selectable in a mutually exclusive manner between destructively reading the messages from the queue and non-destructively reading the message from the queue" (see Couch et al., [0009], [0033], [0038] and [0048]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Couch et al. into Landfield et al.'s system. A

Art Unit: 2164

person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide an effective and flexible way to manage and control messages in the queue since the function of reading either destructively or non-destructively provides the administrator with reading access to the electronic message itself not just its properties and header information. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and a user interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein the computer system further executes a control module operable to perform the selection of the first module to remove at least one of the plurality of messages read from the queue” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 58-61], [column 6, lines 24-30 and 65-67] and Fig. 3A; Couch et al., [0048] for destructively reads).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein the computer system further executes a control module operable to perform the selection of the first module to remove each of the plurality of messages from the queue” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 58-61], [column 6, lines 24-30 and 65-67] and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein each of the plurality of messages includes attributes and wherein the second module is further operable to display the attributes of each of the plurality of message” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein the plurality of messages each includes attributes and wherein the second module is operable to display sectional identifiers in the hierarchical structure related to the attributes of each one of the plurality of messages” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A wherein a table including many rows wherein each row includes many column represents a hierarchical structure).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein each of attributes is displayed, by the second module, adjacent the sectional identifier associated with the attribute” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A wherein each box in the table represent a sectional identifier as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and is similar rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach the inclusion and display of some of attributes but do not teach the inclusion and display of all of attributes as recited in Applicant’s claim language.

However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Landfield et al. and Couch et al. to include and display all the attributes as claimed, since decisions for including and displaying any specific attributes are choices of implementation and depend on system and user requirements of a specific application.

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“wherein each of the plurality of message includes a properties attribute and wherein the second module is operable to display only a portion of the properties attribute” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A wherein displayed information for each message only

shows a portion of properties included in header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant's "properties attribute").

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

"wherein the second module is further operable, in response to selecting the displayed portion of the properties attribute, to display in a viewer the complete properties attribute for viewing" (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein header information is equivalent to Applicant's "complete properties attribute").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

"wherein the second module is further operable to display an identifier associated with the each of the message and a delivery time related to the time the message was delivered to the messaging service" (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 45-55] and Fig. 3A wherein "Queue ID" is equivalent to Applicant's "identifier", and "Queue Time" is equivalent to Applicant's "delivery time").

13. Claim 13, 14 and 21 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333, issued on

7/27/1999) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109, effective filing date 1/2/2002) and Hamilton et al. (Publication No US 2003/0182464, effective filing date 02/15/2002).

As to claim 13, Landfield et al. teaches:

“A method for viewing messaging service messages” (see Landfield et al., Abstract), comprising:

“reading a message originating from a first application and directed to a second application from the queue by a third application” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 37-67]-[column 6, line 1-3] wherein the electronic mail management system (third application) reading messages from the message queue wherein messages are originated from a mail application program (first application) on one computer system and directed to another mail program (second application) on another computer system).

However, Landfield et al. does not disclose reading message including reading full contents of the message.

On the other hand, Couch et al. teaches reading message including reading full contents of the message (see Couch et al., [0033]-[0035] and [0004]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Couch et al. into Landfield et al.'s system. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provides an effective way to manage the message queue and control contents of messages in the queue. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are

directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and a user interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“displaying full contents of the message using the third application” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 57-67]-[column 6, line 1-3] for displaying message information (i.e., properties, header information) read from the message queue; see Couch et al., [0033]-[0034] for reading message content).

“verifying the read message has a correct message structure, that fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that destination of the message is correct to verify whether the test application is operating properly” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] and Fig. 3A for verifying proper addressing of the recipients (i.e., destination); and see Couch et al., [0056] and [0070] for verifying the formatting (structure) of message data and information in fields of message structure).

However, Landfield et al. and Couch et al. do not teach:

“selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification”; and

“selecting a queue supported by the messaging service by inputting a queue identification”.

On the other hand, Hamilton et al. teaches:

“selecting a host computer implementing the messaging service by inputting a host computer identification” (see Hamilton et al., [0133] for specifying an IP address wherein the IP address is interpreted as identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue); and

“selecting a queue supported by the messaging service by inputting a queue identification” (see Hamilton et al., [0133] for specifying the name of the queue instance).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hamilton et al. to Landfield et al. (as modified by Couch et al.)’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Hamilton et al., [0051]-[0052] to provide an effective system for managing queues on a plurality of host computers. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions and queue management. This close relation highly suggests an expectation of success.

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Hamilton et al. teach:

“wherein the message includes a plurality of attributes” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A; and see Couch et al., [0004]).

As to claim 21, Landfield et al. teach:

“A method of testing an application which generates messaging service messages” (see Landfield et al., Abstract), comprising:

“running the test application” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 20-40] wherein any mail application can be a test application);

“generating a message by the test application directed to a second application” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 20-55] wherein mail application which sends a mail message is equivalent to Applicant’s “test application” and mail application which receives the mail message is equivalent to Applicant’s “second application”);

“posting the message to a queue” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 25-30]); and

“displaying the read message using the third application, wherein the message is not directed to the third application and the third application is not a normal receiver of the message” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 37-43] wherein the electronic mail management system is interpreted as the third application and wherein mail application program is a normal receiver of the message).

However, Landfield et al. does not teach:

“destructively reading the message from the queue with the third application”.

On the other hand, Couch et al. teaches:

“destructively reading the message from the queue with the third application” (see Couch et al., [0033] and [0048]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Couch et al. into Landfield et al.’s system. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provides an

Art Unit: 2164

effective and flexible way to manage and control messages in the queue since the function of destructively reading provides the administrator with reading access to the electronic message itself not just its properties and header information and managing the queue. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions to manage and access messages from a message queues, and a user interface which allows access to message queue. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. teach:

“verifying the read message has a correct message structure, that fields of the message structure contain correct information, and that destination of the message is correct to verify whether the test application is operating properly” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] and Fig. 3A for verifying proper addressing of the recipients (i.e., destination); and see Couch et al., [0056] and [0070] for verifying the formatting (structure) of message data and information in fields of message structure).

However, Landfield et al. and Couch et al. do not teach:

“inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue using a third application”; and

“inputting an identification of the queue using the third application”.

On the other hand, Hamilton et al. teaches:

“inputting an identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue using a third application” (see Hamilton et al., [0133] for specifying an IP address wherein the IP address is interpreted as identification of a host computer system maintaining the queue); and

“inputting an identification of the queue using the third application” (see Hamilton et al., [0133] for specifying the name of the queue instance).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hamilton et al. to Landfield et al. (as modified by Couch et al.)’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Hamilton et al., [0051]-[0052] to provide an effective system for managing queues on a plurality of host computers. In addition, both of the references teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, messaging system using message queue which is managed by a queue manager, messaging functions and queue management. This close relation highly suggests an expectation of success.

14. Claims 2-3 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333, issued on 7/27/1999) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109, effective filing date 1/2/2002), and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366, effective filing date 12/18/2001).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Art Unit: 2164

Landfield et al. and Couch et al. do not teach “wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service”.

Robinson teaches “wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service” (see Robinson, [0003], [0014] and [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Landfield et al. and Couch et al.’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide a convenient and flexible way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service is an asynchronous messaging system.

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Robinson teach “wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server” (see Robinson, [0015]).

15. Claims 15-20 and 22 (effective filing date 10/14/2003) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landfield et al. (US Patent No 5,928,333, issued on 7/27/1999) in view of Couch et al. (Publication No US 2003/0126109, effective filing date 1/2/2002) and Hamilton et al. (Publication No US 2003/0182464, effective filing date 02/15/2002), and further in view of Robinson (Publication No US 2003/0115366, effective filing date 12/18/2001).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Hamilton et al. do not teach “wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server”.

Robinson teaches “wherein the queue is on a java messaging service message server” (see Robinson, [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Landfield et al. (as modified by Couch et al. and Hamilton et al.)’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to implementing a queue on a java messaging service message server to provide an effective way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service message server is an asynchronous messaging server.

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Hamilton et al. do not teach
“selecting a profile identifying the host computer and having information to connect to the host computer, the profile further identifying the queue”;
“logging on the host computer using the profile”; and
“connecting to the queue using the profile”.

Robinson teaches:

“selecting a profile of the host computer having the host computer identification to connect to the host computer, the profile further having the queue identification” (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] and [0029] wherein connection factory encapsulating connection configuration information is equivalent to Applicant’s “profile”);

“logging to the host computer using the profile” (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] wherein open communication channel between an application and the messaging system is equivalent to logging as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language); and

“connecting to the queue using the profile” (see Robinson, [0017]-[0019] wherein connection factory is equivalent to Applicant’s “profile” and the disclosure of using the connection factory to create a connection to a queue is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Landfield et al. (as modified by Couch et al. and Hamilton et al.)’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so since using profile to connect and log in the computer system and its resources (such as queues) provides effective and efficient way to access to the systems and resource as well as allows better control over resource accesses.

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al., Hamilton et al. and Robinson teach:

“selecting a consume control determining whether to consume the messages after the message is read” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A for processing buttons (i.e., Bounce, Delete, etc); and see Couch et al., [0048] wherein READ or RECEIVE are example of consume control); and

“consuming the message when the consume control has been selected to consume the message” (see Landfield et al., [column 6, lines 65-67]; also see Couch et al., [0033] and [0048]).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 17 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al., Hamilton et al. and Robinson teach:

“displaying attribute headings including indicia identifying attributes of the message” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A wherein column headings is equivalent to Applicant’s “attribute headings”);

“displaying each of the attributes of the message adjacent one of the associated attribute headings” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al., Hamilton et al. and Robinson teach:

“displaying a portion of a properties attribute of the message” (see Landfield et al., Fig. 3A wherein displayed information related to each message represents a portion of header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant’s “properties attribute”;

“selecting the properties attribute” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] for selecting headers button); and

“displaying the properties attribute in a viewer operable to view an entire text of the properties attribute of the message” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 3-10] wherein header information represents an entire text of the header of the message wherein header of the message is equivalent to Applicant’s “properties attribute”).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 18 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al., Hamilton et al. and Robinson teach:

“searching the message read from the queue for a string of text” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 34-45]); and

“identifying the message having text matching the string text” (see Landfield et al., [column 7, lines 40-45]).

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Hamilton et al. teach “wherein one of the fields of the message structure is an attribute field, and wherein displaying the read message includes displaying attributes of the attribute field” (see Landfield et al., [column 5, lines 35-45] and Fig. 3A wherein the electronic mail management program is equivalent to Applicant’s “third application”; also see Couch et al., [0004] and [0070]).

However, Landfield et al., Couch et al. and Hamilton et al. do not teach “wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service”.

On the other hand, Robinson teaches “wherein the queue is supported by a java messaging service” (see Robinson, [0003], [0014] and [0015]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Robinson into Landfield et al. (as modified by Couch et al. and Hamilton et al.)’s system. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so to provide a convenient and flexible way to asynchronously deliver messages because java messaging service is an asynchronous messaging system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phuong-Thao Cao
Art Unit 2164
August 28, 2007


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER